
From:
Sent: Friday, September 15, 2017 1:51 PM
To: Romero, Michael J.
Subject: FW: FY'18 Total Budget 82917.xls
Attachments: FY'18 Total Budget 82917.xls

Mike, did you see the change I suggested on this report?

For OSDH, General Revenue is only derived from general appropriation (unless we had an interagency general appropriation budget. For ex., through an interagency transfer or something). The General Revenue is represented by our 198K fund numbers.

When they pull up our budget externally they should see the \$53 million (the same we will see when we pull up our internal general revenue budgets – the 198K budgets) and THEN we have the 198__ budgets – these are NOT general revenue budgets (and I assume that is why they didn't assign them 198K fund number). So, in order to make sure we are accurately showing all our budgets I put the 198__ budgets on that next line so it is documented in the file but not confused with general appropriation (198K).

Does this seem reasonable? Need to get this off to Senate today.

Julie

Julie Cox-Kain
Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services
Sr. Deputy Commissioner
Oklahoma State Department of Health
(405)271-4200
juliek@health.ok.gov

From: Cox-Kain, Julie
Sent: Wednesday, September 13, 2017 5:04 PM
To: Romero, Michael J. <MichaelR@health.ok.gov>; Scanlan, Felesha F. <FeleshaS@health.ok.gov>
Subject: FY'18 Total Budget 82917.xls

Okay, let's think about it this way. The internal 198GI budgets shouldn't be in the top line because it is not a state appropriated budget. So, I created another line that is just SFY '18 operational budget and copied the amount into "other" just like it was shown in the top line.

The reality is when we took down the WO we probably didn't have to change the fund number we just needed to associate the expense with the appropriate service chief code... anyway, water under the bridge now. If we get a call (and we might very well get a call) we will just tell them we are projecting less revenue than we have to support the current budget and have isolated the amount so we can reduce expenses and (ultimately) the budget.

So... in other words your 198GI is in the second line.

Seem reasonable?